

## Red Legged Frog/Stream Monitoring (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700564

### A. Statement of Planning Objectives

The California red-legged Frog (CRLF) Planning Grant consists of a survey and manage approach to update current information on the distribution and locations of CRLF on the Plumas National Forest. Current lack of information on CRLF presence/absence on the west slope of the forest forced the Plumas NF to postpone a decision on adopting over 20 miles of OHV routes due to this shortfall of survey information. Therefore the objective of the survey and manage approach for CRLF would be to verify presence or absence of individuals in habitats near and adjacent to highly demanded single track OHV routes by conducting U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service approved protocol surveys. Depending on the outcome of the survey efforts, the manage component of the Planning Grant would be implemented. The Manage component would involve two scenarios; 1) If CRLF were found, the trail would not be considered for future inclusion into the transportation system and trail signs would be available to educate the OHV community on the presence of CRLF in the adjacent area and the need to minimize impacts to the CRLF as required by the Forest Service's Travel Management Rule. The posting of these signs will be done under the ground operations grant; 2) If no CRLF were found, the trail would be considered for addition to the transportation system and future management. Part of the management would include the development of educational brochures and interpretive signs educating the OHV community on the importance of minimizing impacts to suitable unoccupied habitat while incorporating the tread lightly message and monitoring downstream habitat using the Stream Condition Inventory protocol.

### B. Relation of Proposed Project to OHV Recreation

This project relates to OHV recreation in that the opportunity exists for additional trails to be added to the transportation system on the west slope of Plumas NF where a big demand exists for single track trails. Currently, these opportunities are not available due to the lack of current information, distribution and verified locations of CRLF.

### C. Statement of Activities

Under this planning grant, the Plumas NF plans to conduct the following activities: 1) CRLF surveys to current U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service protocols on approximately 15 sites within French Creek and the west slope of the Plumas NF, 2) Develop closure signs for user created routes that occur within or near newly found locations of CRLF, 3) Develop interpretive signs and educational brochures to educate the OHV community on the importance of maintaining suitable habitat and treading lightly, and 4) monitoring impacts on suitable habitat downstream of OHV routes using the stream condition inventory protocol.

#### Activity 1: CRLF Surveys

- o Protocol Surveys per route \$2,400 x 15 routes = \$36,000
- o (12 visits (6 day/6 night) @ \$200 per visit)
- o Contract Prep and Contract Administration = \$10,000 (FS Match) (3 Points)
- ? Total Costs = \$42,000

#### Activity 2 & 3: Closure Signs

- o Fiberglass Paddle Signs - 40 @ \$5.00 ea = \$200
- o Decals (Closed OHV Routes- 44 @ \$1.20 ea = \$53
- o Custom Decals (Seasonal Use) Set-up fee = \$38
- o Custom Decals (Seasonal Use) – 30 @ 1.20 = \$36
- o Labor for installation/posting = \$2000 (FS Match \$1000)(3 points)
- o Total Costs = \$2,327

#### Interpretive Signs

- o Design = \$2,500 (FS Match)
- o Fabrication of Signs = \$2,000 each X 6 signs - \$12,000
- o Installation/placement of signs: \$500.00/day X 3 days = \$2,500 (FS Match)(3 points)
- o Total Costs = \$17,000.00

#### Educational Brochures

- o Design = \$2,500 (FS match)
- o Fabrication of brochures = 2,500 brochures - \$12,000
- o Forest Aquatic Biologist consultation with USFWS for narratives and design of brochures @ \$350/day X 5 days = \$1,750 (FS match) (3 points)
- o Total Costs = \$16,250.00

#### **D. List of Reports**

This planning grant would generate the following reports, all final: 1) A copy of the final survey report provided the Contractor conducting the CRLF Surveys, 2) Photos, copies or demos of all closure signs, interpretive signs and educational brochures produced and published.

## Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700564

**1. Timeline for Completion**

Attachments:

[Red Legged Frog Timeline](#)

**2. Optional Project-Specific Application Documents**

**3. Optional Project-specific Maps**

## Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:		Version # _____	APP # _____
<b>APPLICANT NAME :</b>	USFS - Plumas National Forest		
<b>PROJECT TITLE :</b>	Red Legged Frog/Stream Monitoring (FINAL)	<b>PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :</b>	G09-02-13-P02
<b>PROJECT TYPE :</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Planning <input type="checkbox"/> Restoration		
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION :</b>	<p>The California red-legged Frog (CRLF) Planning Grant consists of a survey and manage approach to update current information on the distribution and locations of CRLF on the Plumas National Forest. Current lack of information on CRLF presence/absence on the west slope of the forest forced the Plumas NF to postpone a decision on adopting over 20 miles of OHV routes due to this shortfall of survey information. Therefore the objective of the survey and manage approach for CRLF would be to verify presence or absence of individuals in habitats near and adjacent to highly demanded single track OHV routes by conducting U.S. Fish &amp; Wildlife Service approved protocol surveys. Depending on the outcome of the survey efforts, the manage component of the Planning Grant would be implemented. The Manage component would involve two scenarios; 1) If CRLF were found, the trail would not be considered for future inclusion into the transportation system and trail signs would be available to educate the OHV community on the presence of CRLF in the adjacent area and the need to minimize impacts to the CRLF as required by the Forest Service's Travel Management Rule. The posting of these signs will be done under the ground operations grant; 2) If no CRLF were found, the trail would be considered for addition to the transportation system and future management. Part of the management would include the development of educational brochures and interpretive signs educating the OHV community on the importance of minimizing impacts to suitable unoccupied habitat while incorporating the tread lightly message and monitoring downstream habitat using the Stream Condition Inventory protocol.</p>		

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>							
<b>Program Expenses</b>							
<b>1</b>	<b>Staff</b>						
	Other-Forest Wildlife Biologist	15.000	350.000	DAY	0.00	5,250.00	5,250.00
<b>2</b>	<b>Contracts</b>						
	Other-Surveys	180.000	200.000	DAY	36,000.00	0.00	36,000.00
	Other-Contract Prep	1.000	11500.000	EA	0.00	11,500.00	11,500.00
	<b>Total for Contracts</b>				36,000.00	11,500.00	47,500.00
<b>3</b>	<b>Materials / Supplies</b>						

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
 Agency: USFS - Plumas National Forest  
 Application: Red Legged Frog/Stream Monitoring (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
4	Equipment Use Expenses						
5	Equipment Purchases						
6	Others						
7	Indirect Costs						
Total Program Expenses					36,000.00	16,750.00	52,750.00
TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES					36,000.00	16,750.00	52,750.00
TOTAL EXPENDITURES					<b>36,000.00</b>	<b>16,750.00</b>	<b>52,750.00</b>

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Plumas National Forest  
Application: Red Legged Frog/Stream Monitoring (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>					
<b>Program Expenses</b>					
1	Staff	0.00	5,250.00	5,250.00	
2	Contracts	36,000.00	11,500.00	47,500.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	0.00	0.00	
5	Equipment Purchases	0.00	0.00	0.00	
6	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	0.00	0.00	
<b>Total Program Expenses</b>		36,000.00	16,750.00	52,750.00	
<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>		36,000.00	16,750.00	52,750.00	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>		<b>36,000.00</b>	<b>16,750.00</b>	<b>52,750.00</b>	

## Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700564

### ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

#### ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)

#### ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

### ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☒ Yes ☐ No  
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

### ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

No impact to Wetlands, or navigable waters has been identified or documented. Trail maintenance included as part of the Plumas NF OHV program includes use of heavy machinery and hand tools. Signing and route designation will focus use on roads and trails in order to minimize impacts to wetlands. Navigable waters are not impacted by this project. Law enforcement patrols and use of vehicle barriers will further limit intrusion into sensitive areas. Maps included as part of the Wildlife Habitat Protection Program (WHPP) show locations of Threatened, Endangered, and Sensitive Species habitat, in relation to summer OHV routes. All routes are monitored for impacts on wetlands, navigable waters and sensitive habitats. All monitoring activities are recorded and the data is used in development for the grant application and requests are made for funding to accomplish conservation activities, repair or maintenance of these routes or areas to ensure that resource damage does not occur. Level I-III roads and trails are maintained and brought up to "green" standards by FS Road Maintenance Crews. Forest wildlife biologists have indicated that continued signing, management, and monitoring of the OHV use will prevent impact to wetlands and sensitive species habitats.

### ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

Maintenance of OHV routes using State and Federal funds includes maintenance by the use of all types of equipment or hand tools. Drainage devices such as water bars and rolling dips will be installed on 4x4 trails will be maintained, generally by Forest Service and volunteers through the Adopt-A-Trail program. All routes will be patrolled, and drainage devices with a noticeable need for maintenance will be maintained. At this time, additional critical resource protection is not anticipated. The Forest, will respond to soil loss monitoring reports from 2006, by submitting funding requests for resource protection as part of a grant request. No cumulative impacts are expected from doing routine maintenance. However, not conducting

this maintenance may result in soil erosion. Not conducting maintenance will likely result in fewer OHV routes being in compliance with soil loss standards, and eventually result in the closure of routes.

#### ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

Where managed OHV use occurs, no significant effect on the environment is caused due to unusual circumstances such as steep slopes or erodible soils. The Forest has re-routed trails to avoid these types of situations or accomplished trail maintenance, which is repeated as necessary. Currently there is no cross country travel on the Plumas NF, all OHV use must occur on existing roads and trails.

#### ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

No damage to the scenic resources has been documented through our monitoring efforts. While a state scenic highway traverse the Plumas NF, (St. Rte. 70) no impacts to the scenic viewshed have occurred to this highway from OHV activities. OHV routes are not in the immediate vicinity of HWY 70 and cannot be seen from HWY 70.

#### ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

#### ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

This project will cause no adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources. The project is for California Red Legged Frogs.

#### ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

No potential exists for the project to cause indirect significant impacts by causing user groups to go elsewhere, or significantly increasing use in the vicinity of the project. Trail maintenance will enhance and sustain the OHV opportunity Forest wide.

#### CEQA/NEPA Attachment

Attachments:

[Categorical Exclusion](#)

## Planning Project Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700564

### 1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

☐ 76% or more (10 points)

☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)

☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)

☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

### 2. Planning Project - Q 2.

#### A Planning Project - Page 1

2. The Planning Project would address the following 3

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on special-status species habitats

☐ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on cultural resources

☐ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on soil conditions

☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on water quality

☒ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on other recreation uses

☐ Potential effects of OHV Recreation on adjacent lands.

☐ Potential impact to relationships between OHV Recreation and local residents

☐ Toxic or hazardous materials within a Project Area or adjacent property that may impact OHV Recreation

☒ Trail issues such as traffic patterns, trails closures, appropriate uses, etc.

#### B. Planning Project - Page 2

Explain each statement that was checked

This planning grant would address information lacking on CRLF presence or absence that would help address designation of trails on the west-slope of the Plumas NF where demand for OHV single track trails and recreation use is in high demand. The planning grant could potentially allow some or all of the 20 miles of single track trails that were set aside due to lack of CRLF presence-absence information to be reconsidered for inclusion into the transportation system. In addition, the planning grant will address any water quality concerns related to CRLF habitat by implementing Stream Condition Inventory monitoring.

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ 6 or more items checked (4 points)

☒ 4 to 5 items checked (3 points)

☐ 2 to 3 items checked (2 points)

☐ 1 or no items checked (No points)

### 3. Motorized Access - Q 3.

3. The Project would lead to improved facilities that provide motorized access to the following nonmotorized recreation opportunities 6

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each, up to a maximum of 6 points (Please select applicable values)

☒ Camping

☐ Birding

☒ Hiking

☐ Equestrian trails

☒ Fishing

☐ Rock Climbing

☐ Other (Specify)

**4. Public Input - Q 4.**

4. The Project proposal was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: Maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)  
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)  
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

Meetings and calls were held with the stakeholder during the entire travel management process. Additional meetings are planned during the survey work and following the release of the FEIS. Meetings are published in the newspapers in each community.

**5. Stakeholder Input - Q 5.**

5. If the Project were approved, the planning process would incorporate substantial stakeholder input: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points) ☒ Yes (5 points)

If 'Yes', explain, specifically, how it would be 'substantial'. Identify stakeholders

If the project were approved, the planning process would incorporate substantial stakeholder input. Single track stakeholders in west-side communities would be involved and kept informed during the implementation of this planning grant. Input would also be solicited for brochures, interpretive signs and closure signs.

**6. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 6.**

6. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)  
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s)

Single track stakeholders include Paradise Ridge Riders, Ironman Dual Sport, Sierra Access Coalition, CORVA, Blue Ribbon Coalition, and the US Fish & Wildlife Service. Other interested parties include CA 4WD Association, and Ophir Gopher Jeep Club. .

**7. Sustain OHV Opportunity - Q 7.**

7. The Planning Project sustains OHV Opportunity in the following manner 7

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☐ Project will develop management plans for existing OHV Opportunity (4 points)  
☒ Project will complete environmental review for an OHV Development Project (3 points)  
☐ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities adjacent to population centers (3 points)  
☒ Project supports development of OHV Opportunities in areas that lack legal OHV Opportunity (2 points)  
☒ Project will develop a system of designated OHV routes for an existing OHV Opportunity (2 points)

Explain each statement that was checked

Without the OHV grant, no opportunities would exist to incorporate user created routes into the transportation system and allow legal riding opportunities. The surveys will provide a complete travel management document to provide OHV opportunities.

**8. Identification of Funding Sources - Q 8.**

8. Funds for implementing the completed plan have been identified 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

Funding would be allocated from force account funds in FY2011.

Reference Document

Forest Service Budget for FY 2011

**9. Offsite Impacts - Q 9.**

9. The Planning Project would address offsite impacts relative to the Project Area (e.g., sound, fugitive dust, runoff): 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (5 points)

Explain 'Yes' response

SCI monitoring would address offsite impacts related to OHV use crossing streams.